



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,134	10/29/2003	Kazutoshi Toda	033737.028	5520
25461	7590	12/21/2005	EXAMINER	
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP 1230 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E. SUITE 3100, PROMENADE II ATLANTA, GA 30309-3592			FOOTLAND, LENARD A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3682	
DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/696,134	TODA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lenard A. Footland	3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13, 16-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Applicant's election with traverse of the article invention is acknowledged. Claim(s) 18-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Because of required separate searches, the restriction is made final.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12-13,¹⁷ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Folger et al. The examiner finds all claimed subject matter to be present.

See Fig. 3 and col. 3, lines 16-20.

There is reason to believe, based on the similarity of material and structure that the functional limitation(s) of compressive stress and hardness may be (an) inherent characteristic(s) of the reference material. In accordance with *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977):

[W]here the Patent Office has reason to believe that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in the claimed subject matter may, in fact, be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, it possesses the authority to require the applicant to prove that the subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on.

This “burden of rebutting [may be of] the PTO’s reasonable assertion of inherency under 35 USC 102, or of prima facie obviousness under 35 USC 103” (195 USPQ at 432).

Accordingly, the burden is placed upon the applicant to prove that the limitation(s) in question is/are not (an) inherent characteristic(s) of the reference disclosure, particularly since original claim 15 indicates that standard steels are employed.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim(s) 3, 7, 11, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Folger et al. as set forth in the rejection of

claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12-13¹⁷ above, and further in view of official notice of common knowledge in the art, or, in the alternative, engineering design choice.

The examiner finds that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the additional feature(s) of size, suj2 etc. steel, quenching, carburizing, etc. in question since it was known in the art to do so to provide the function(s) disclosed.

Alternatively, the examiner finds that the broad provision of this/these features *vis-à-vis* that/those disclosed by the reference solve(s) no stated problem insofar as the record is concerned and, accordingly, would have been an obvious matter of design choice. See *In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975). Clearly, hole size is without criticality.

Also, note that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for the intended use is a design consideration within the skill in the art. *In re Leshin*, 227 F.2d 197, 199, 125 USPQ 416, 418 (CCPA 1960).

This application contains claims drawn to an invention non-elected with traverse. A complete response to the final rejection must include cancellation of non-elected claims or other appropriate action (37 C.F.R. § 1.144) M.P.E.P. § 821.01. Failing this, an application otherwise ready for allowance will be taken to have authorization to have such claims canceled by examiner's amendment.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument regarding intended use, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

In response to Applicant's arguments, 37 CFR § 1.111(c) requires applicant to "clearly point out the patentable novelty which he thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections." In this case, applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty and failed to show how the amendment avoids the combination of references applied against the claim.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY

PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenard A. Footland, whose telephone number is (571) 272-7103.



Lenard A. Footland

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 3600

Art Unit 3682

laf

December 18, 2005